

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                               |      | FILING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR    | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/762,718                                    | •    | 01/22/2004    | Yashavant Vinayak Vinod | FL0239USNA          | 5200             |
| 23906   | 7590 | 07/11/2005    |                         | EXAMINER            |                  |
|   |      | NEMOURS AND ( | HURLEY, SHAUN R         |                     |                  |
|   |      | ECORDS CENTER | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
| BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 4417 LANCASTER PIKE |      |               |                         |                     | TATER NORDER     |
| WILMING                                       |      |               |                         | 3765                | -                |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| ·  | *  | <u>e</u>   |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |
| •  | 10/762,718   | VINOD ET AL.   |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |
|  | Shaun R. Hurley  | 3765   |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply   | pears on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence address  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL  | Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH   | S) FROM  |  |
| THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replection of the priod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin<br>y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day<br>will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from<br>, cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |
| Status   |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 J  | anuary 2004.   |  |  |
| •  | action is non-final.   |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowa   | nce except for formal matters, pro   | secution as to the merits is   |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E   | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45  | 53 O.G. 213.   |  |
| Disposition of Claims  | •  |  |  |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application   |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra   | wn from consideration.   |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.  |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o   | r election requirement.  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine   | er.  |  |  |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc   | epted or b) $\square$ objected to by the I   | Examiner.  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the  | •  | ` '  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct   | , -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -,   | , ,  |  |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex   | caminer. Note the attached Office  | Action or form PTO-152.  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea  | s have been received. s have been received in Applicati nty documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  | on No<br>ed in this National Stage   |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list   | or the certified copies not receive  | ea.  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  |  |  |  |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 4) ∭ Interview Summary<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Da  |  |  |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/12/04, 02/23/04</u> .   |  | atent Application (PTO-152)  |  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, and 7-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson et al (6132866) in view of Windley (4295329).

Nelson teaches a yarn blend comprising fluoropolymer (including ethylene copolymer) fiber and polyamide (Abstract; Column 2 lines 11-20; lines 43-58). While Nelson essentially teaches the invention as detailed, including many different possible yarn structures (Column 3, lines 22-35), he fails to specifically teach commingled yarn structure, which Windley teaches (Abstract; figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to utilize the commingled structure as taught by Windley in the yarn blend of Nelson, so as to enable a reasonable blend of the composite components while increasing the overall yarn strength. The ordinarily skilled artisan would understand that utilizing a commingled yarn as opposed to a blended yarn would provide a substructure more capable of providing strength above that of a staple blend, and would know to do such, so as to improve the yarn strength in a known manner. In regards to multiple yarns, Nelson teaches rations of the fibers in the blend (Column 2 line 66 - Column 3 line 4) which would obviously teach multiple ends of either the fluoropolymer or the amide to fulfill such ratios. In regards to the myriad requirements of strength of both the component yarns, and the overall yarns, all are

Art Unit: 3765

properties based upon the structure and materials utilized, both of which are taught in the prior art of record as detailed above. As such, the resultant strengths are likewise obviously taught. In regards to a binder fiber in the yarn blend, such binder fibers are well known in the art as a way to bind together component fibers, adding strength to the yarn and preventing yarn deconstruction, and such use is well within the scope of the ordinarily skilled artisan's knowledge.

3. Claims 1 and 4-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson et al (6132866) in view of Van Hook (5802839).

Nelson teaches a yarn blend comprising fluoropolymer fiber and polyamide. While Nelson essentially teaches the invention as detailed, including many different possible yarn structures, he fails to specifically teach a stranded, corded yarn structure, which Van Hook teaches (Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to utilize the stranded cord structure as taught by Van Hook in the yarn blend of Nelson, so as to enable a reasonable blend of the composite components while increasing the overall yarn strength. The ordinarily skilled artisan would understand that utilizing a stranded cord yarn as opposed to a blended yarn would provide a substructure more capable of providing strength above that of a staple blend, and would know to do such, so as to improve the yarn strength in a known manner. In regards to multiple yarns, Nelson teaches rations of the fibers in the blend which would obviously teach multiple ends of either the fluoropolymer or the amide to fulfill such ratios. In regards to the myriad requirements of strength of both the component yarns, and the overall yarns, all are properties based upon the structure and materials utilized, both of which are taught in the prior art of record as detailed

above. As such, the resultant strengths are likewise obviously taught. In regards to a binder fiber in the yarn blend, such binder fibers are well known in the art as a way to bind together component fibers, adding strength to the yarn and preventing yarn deconstruction, and such use is well within the scope of the ordinarily skilled artisan's knowledge.

Page 4

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of Windley as applied to claims 1, 2, and 7-19 above, and further in view of Hatch (TEXTILE SCIENCE).

The combination of Nelson in view of Windley essentially teaches the invention as discussed above, but fails to specifically teach the dying of one component and leaving the second component undyed, which Hatch teaches is well known in the dyeing art (multiple dyeing methods, pages 226-243). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to utilize such a dying technique, so as to create a heather look in the yarn. The ordinarily skilled artisan would know how to do this since such methods are well known, and would understand the aesthetic benefits of such a dyeing choice.

## Conclusion

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cistone et al (2002/0155289) teaches what is well known in the art.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shaun R. Hurley whose telephone number is (571) 272-4986. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon Fri, 6:30 am 3:00 pm, off second Friday.

Application/Control Number: 10/762,718

Art Unit: 3765

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John J. Calvert can be reached on (571) 272-4983. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**SRH** 

06 July 2005

Page 5

Patent Examiner

Tech Center 3700